## Exhibit 2

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
                    Alexandria Division
BMG RIGHTS MANAGEMENT (US) LLC, :
et al.,
              Plaintiffs, :
                              : Case No. 1:14-cv-1611
    VS.
COX ENTERPRISES, INC., et al., :
        Defendants.
                            VOLUME 1 (a.m. portion)
                      TRIAL TRANSCRIPT
                      December 2, 2015
             Before: Liam O'Grady, USDC Judge
                        And a Jury
```

had fixed its notices, it could have negotiated daily limits because it represents multiple rights holders, and there would be a record in CATS for every notice, including all these one-ticket things, the first notices for hold for more, and complaints above the daily limit. They would all be preserved with all the customer account information in it if they had used the system that Cox already had in place long before Rightscorp even first started creating its code to send all these e-mails.

And Cox does a lot to do the things that BMG and Rightscorp have said that they care about: educating people, working with people, getting them to understand the problem, the graduated response program, complying with subpoenas are obviously there, but they provide educational programs that you heard about from Mr. Cadenhead, information on the Web site so people could learn about this issue. They cooperate with many rights owners, and they also fight a huge number of other problems on the Internet.

Copyright infringement is a big global problem, but it's not the only problem. There's hacking. There's security problems. There's spam. There's denial of service attacks. There's viruses and malware that can take control of people's accounts, that can take their credit card information, that can wreak havoc on people, and Cox is dealing with all of those problems. It works with the FBI, it works with the Department

of Homeland Security, and it tries to balance all of these issues.

Now, there are those cases when somebody goes through the process and it's time to terminate, and there have been some e-mails and some chats between employees, mostly Mr. Zabek and his colleagues, about termination, reactivation, and connecting those things to revenue. People have said, we need the revenue. We need the customers. We've all seen those e-mails.

Those e-mails reflect bad judgment. They reflect bad decisions. I think they're offensive, but they're not Cox's policy, and they are not about this case. Not one of those e-mails was about a BMG notice, not about a situation with Rightscorp at all. They're not about the response to Rightscorp or BMG.

Cox's response to Rightscorp, which is what the issue here is in this case, was not about revenue. It was about the unfairness of demanding payment based on unproven accusations.

And Cox has worked to improve its process, as you heard from Mr. Vredenburg: "When we terminate somebody, we don't turn them back on. What we do now is we go through the final suspensions, we tell the customer, 'All right, we're going to talk to you twice, and on the next -- third suspension, you're done.' We terminate them. We don't even talk to them."